

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

things which must have existed at the time of the Trojan War, and could not have existed after it, nor for a long time before. It must in fact be essentially a contemporaneous document.

His conclusion, then, is that the Iliad gives a true picture of a real event, that a great war was fought at Troy between essentially the same forces as those named by Homer. Professor Allen has already shown that the Greek Catalogue is an old and authentic document; now Dr. Leaf gives the Trojan Catalogue a place in the earliest conceptions of the poem. What a change from the current opinion that the Trojan Catalogue is a late makeshift added in order to give the Trojans something similar to the Greek Catalogue! A study of the Trojan Catalogue and modern sailing directions shows that the Catalogue is based on trade routes radiating from the Hellespont. The most eager allies were the Lycians; it was for them a life and death struggle, since the eastward advancing power of Greece meant the loss of trade by which they lived. The trade to and from the early sites of Miletus, Amphipolis, Cyzicus, and Sinope must pass by Troy, so that her position at the Hellespont allowed her to extract tribute thereon. Her wealth and power depended on the ability to hold a fortress strong enough to block this trade. The presence of this stronghold prohibited Greek commerce and influence from getting a footing in Asia. On page 326 we read:

The argument then is briefly this. Given the known data—the Hellespont an essential economic necessity to Greece, but blocked by a strong fort, and the expansion of Greece to the Euxine at the beginning of the historical period—there must have been a point at which that fort was taken by the Greeks. And it must have been taken much in the way which Homer describes, by a process of wearing down. A war of Troy therefore is a necessary deduction from purely geographical conditions, and the account of it in Homer agrees with all the probabilities of the case. And it must have taken place at the very point of expansion which is depicted in the Catalogue—when the Achaians had occupied Greece and stretched across the islands as far as Rhodes. Their next step must be to the mainland. They are faced by a hostile, or at least foreign, population along the whole western coast of Asia Minor. All geographical conditions point to the mouth of the Hellespont as the strategic point of attack; there they can not only win the trade which is their chief object, but they can strike a telling blow at all the peoples of the mainland, especially the most formidable of them, the Lykians. The whole situation described in the Iliad is absolutely in accord with the inferences which are to be drawn from geography on the one hand and the ruins of Hissarlik on the other.

The Trojan War was not so much a series of battles as a siege, and the great foray in which Thebe and Lyrnessus were destroyed was not undertaken so much for plunder as to cut off from the city the chief source of supplies; Achilles, then, followed the same plan of campaign as Sherman in his march through Georgia. Troy was to be starved rather than stormed. When the Greeks took from Troy the power to levy tribute her career was ended; compare page 324:

We now see why it was that Troy never recovered from its capture by the Achaians, but lingered on *honoris causa*. . . . It was not the capture, but Greek colonisation, which destroyed Troy. It had one merit only—that it could block the Hellespont to the west. As soon as the west had taken possession of both shores of the Hellespont, Troy was for practical purposes useless.

Dr. Leaf has, surely, found the true cause of the early prosperity and the subsequent decline of Troy. A theory so sensible can hardly fail of general acceptance. This is the first explanation which gives an adequate reason for the war and for its greatness, and at the same time shows how impossible it is that it should have been fought by colonists, or that the Iliad should be the conglomerate description of small tribal wars waged in various parts of Greece from Crete to Thessaly.

The author's attempt to locate the Pelasgians leads him to the conclusion that the name is not racial but a general designation of those border peoples who obstructed the advance of the Greeks; hence it is applied to various shifting tribes. It is impossible to do justice in a brief review to the brilliancy of this simple and plausible solution of one of the most perplexing problems in Greek history.

In all his previous writings Dr. Leaf has been the cautious and learned follower of German skepticism and erudition. In this book he appears in his own right as a brilliant and original thinker; he has completely broken with the traditions which hampered him, and the doubter who looked at all things with suspicion has become the enthusiastic believer. No wonder that Andrew Lang wrote on the proof which Mr. Leaf sent him, "Why, you are *plus royaliste que le roi*". Although Dr. Leaf has achieved so much in business and in scholarship, he is still a comparatively young man, and, now that he is free from skeptical bondage, he may be expected to solve many of the most difficult Homeric problems.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY. JOHN A. SCOTT.

Wie studiert man klassische Philologie? By Otto Immisch. Stuttgart: Wilhelm Violet (1909). Pp. 192. 250 Mk.

To the German lad who has stood his last examination as Oberprimaner and looks forward to a university training in the Classics, Professor Immisch offers this volume as a practical means of preparation for lectures in October. Out of a total of 190 pages he gives a round hundred (Chapter 2) to a really fascinating sketch of the history of classical philology from the Homerists to Usener and Rohde. Half of the remaining pages (Chapter 4) he devotes to a discussion of the science in its present-day complexity, treating in neat paragraphs the several subdivisions of the general field and noting in an appreciative manner the great handbooks, periodicals, and

other important "Hilfsmittel". In a few pages (Chapter 3) he suggests the relation of the discipline to other branches of knowledge.

All this is in the nature of information, clearly and attractively presented. Much of the charm of the book, however, lies in the introductory chapter of General Observations and in the addendum of Practical Hints (Chapter 5), where the genial professor puts himself on thoroughly intimate terms with his prospective young 'akademischer Bürger', advising him in all manner of interesting things, from the proper care of the health to the choice of a fraternity. He must win youthful confidence when he describes (page 90) the "leidenschaftlichen Debatten der studentischen Jugend am Biertisch" as "ein köstliches Stück des wahren akademischen Burschentums"; but he follows up his advantage with a timely warning against "jene ewig studierenden Schwätzer über die Methode". 'Wer von der Sache nichts versteht', he quotes sagely, 'redet über die Methode'.

If the author's intimacy with his reader borders on the *naif*, what he says is wholesome and refreshing, and the hundred well-written pages on the history of classical scholarship make the little book a real desideratum for the reading shelf of the American as well as of the German student of the Classics.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY. JOHN R. CRAWFORD.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY has called attention more than once to the Loeb Classical Library (see 5.126-127, 6.82-86). Some of the translations will be reviewed at length in the current volume. At this time I wish to call attention to the translation of St. Augustine's Confessions, in two volumes. The translation made by the Reverend William Watts, and published in 1631 has been revised by Dr. Rouse, one of the general editors of the Library; as far as possible Watts's text has been kept, and where correction of Watts was necessary, his style has been reproduced. Prefixed to the translation are some six pages written by Mr. James Loeb himself, in which he describes in an interesting way the development of his plans for the Library, and sets forth its purpose and its scope. One remark in the translator's preface, that "the style of Augustine, both condensed in phrase and formless in structure, could not possibly be reproduced", I find especially interesting; other translators in the Series may think themselves confronted by a similar impossibility of reproducing the style of the original. C. K.

CORRESPONDENCE

May I tell my troubles as a teacher of Latin to the readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY and ask their advice? There is one matter connected with the teaching of first year forms which has given me much concern. Often pupils who have had a year of Latin in a High School in one of the States apply for admission to the second year class in our school. They represent different sections of the country and different methods of teaching first year Latin.

Sooner or later I am forced to give those who come to me an examination involving the principles illustrated in the following questions:

Nom. *arx, sedile, volnus, mater.*

Gen. *arcis, sedilis volneris, matris.*

Give the stem, singular accusative and ablative, plural genitive and accusative, of the above nouns.

Form the nominative singular from the following stems:

oper, virgin, carmin, equit, indic, calcari.

(I try to give nouns that the pupil has never seen).

Never have I found a student who could pass that examination. Those who take it usually say that they never heard of such principles as are there involved. I once offered to help in Latin prose a boy from a Northern High School who was about to take his college entrance examination. He wrote—*um* as the genitive ending of an *i*-stem noun. "But", said I, "you should have known that that was an *i*-stem noun". "How could I know it?", said he, "I have often wondered how one might recognize an *i*-stem noun".

What is the explanation of this state of things? Do the teachers of the country feel that the above questions represent two unimportant details of Latin forms? Yet how can pupils deal with new words in their texts unless they know these principles? How find the meaning of *custodem*, met for the first time, unless the nominative can be formed from the stem? How write the genitive plural of *collis* unless one knows that nouns of this type are *i*-stems? Am I wasting time when I use the recitation period for drill in these principles?

H. MAY JOHNSON.

EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, Washington, D. C.

The following quotations from The Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Volume 8, seem worth while; the first is dated in January, 1853, the other in February, 1855.

When I think of the robust Greek mythology and what a cosmic imagination—I wish to say astronomic imagination—they had, a power, I mean, of expressing in graceful fable the laws of the world, so that the mythology is beautiful poetry on one side, at any moment convertible into severe science on the other,—then, the English verse looks poor and purposeless, as if written for hire, and not obeying the grandeur of Ideas.

Greeks. 'Tis strange what immortality is in their very rags; so much mentality about the race has made every shred durable.

We run very fast, but here is this horrible Plato, at the end of the course, still abreast of us. Our novelties we can find all in his book. He has anticipated our latest neology.

The history says, the Romans conquered the Greeks: but I analyse the Roman language, I read the Roman books, I behold the Roman buildings, I dig up marbles in the Roman gardens; and I find Greeks everywhere still paramount, in art, in thought; —and in my history, the Greeks conquered Rome.